



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/813,487

03/21/2001

Gene F. Lee

0007056-0081/P5192/RJL

2110

32291

7590

12/06/2006

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

ISMAL, SHAWKI SAIF

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/813,487

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Shawki S. Ismail

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11,12,14,15,18,19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11,12,14,15,18,19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This action is responsive to the amendment received on September 6, 2006.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended.

Claims 2-3, 9-10, 13, 16-17 and 20 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19 and 21 are pending.

The New Ground(s) of Rejection

Applicant's amendment and arguments received on September 6, 2006 have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

MPEP 2106 IV.B.2.(b)

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Schrader, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical

Art Unit: 2155

application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application within the technological arts.

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, and 14, in view of the above cited MPEP sections, are not statutory because they merely recite a number of computing steps without producing any tangible result and/or being limited to a practical application within the technological arts. The use of a computer has not been indicated.

"TANGIBLE RESULT"

The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a ... process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 .

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19 and 21, in view of the above cited MPEP sections, are not statutory because the claims do not produce any *tangible results*. The claims merely recite program code for doing a function and does not perform these functions.

Art Unit: 2155

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schneider et al.**, (Schneider) U.S. Patent No. **6,785,728**..

5. As to claim 1, Schneider teaches a method for administration of a thin client architecture comprising:

distributing a plurality of administrative tasks among said administrators refer to col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 36 and col. 15, lines 45-59);

the distributing includes dividing said administrative tasks into a plurality of task groups (**user groups**), each task group comprising common needs (**access**) of a separate and discrete (**different applications**) subset of users in a system, wherein a first number of said groups is equal to a second number of said administrators (**at least one administrator per user group**) (refer to col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 36 and col. 15, lines 45-59); and

executing said administrative tasks (refer to col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 36 and col. 15, lines 45-59)

Schneider does not explicitly indicate that the administrators being teachers of students, wherein the students are users of a system and each teacher responsible for administering a class related to the teacher.

Teachers in classrooms act as the as administrators to their students. They configure the network, maintain the network's shared resources and security, as well as assign passwords and privileges to their students. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to think of the administrators as teaches of students.

6. As to claim 4, Schneider teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said administrative tasks are user account creation tasks (col. 23, lines 35-42).

7. As to claim 5, Schneider teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said administrative tasks are workgroup administration tasks (col. 23, lines 35-42).

8. As to claim 6, Schneider teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said administrators are educators (an administrator is the manager of LAN and therefore is the educator to those connected to the network by configuring the network, maintaining the network's shared resources and security, assigning passwords and privileges and helping users.)

9. As to claim 7, Schneider teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

storing an account state for a user; and routing said account state to a terminal wherein said user is logged into said terminal (col. 23, lines 35-42).

10. As to claims 8, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19, and 21 they do not teach or define any new limitation above claims 1-7, therefore, they are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment and arguments have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
November 24, 2006



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER